

Remarks/Arguments

Specification

The Examiner has objected to the abstract because of a typographical error in line 6 of the abstract. It is believed that the above amendment to the abstract obviates the objection. Accordingly, applicants respectfully request withdrawal of the objection.

Claim Rejections – 35 USC § 103

The Examiner has rejected claims 1 and 11 under 35 USC 103(a) as being obvious over WO 00/12935 (Wuest et al. US equivalent US6,540,505) in view of US4,471,145(Chu et al.) and US6,392,108 (O'Rear). The rejection is respectfully traversed for the following reasons.

The invention is directed to a process to generate heat by burning a liquid fuel in an evaporator oven, wherein the liquid fuel comprises a Fischer-Tropsch-derived fuel. In the Fischer-Tropsch synthesis, synthesis gas (carbon monoxide and hydrogen) is converted in several steps to hydrocarbon products, in particular n- and iso-paraffins. The invention thus resides in the selection of a particular fuel for evaporator burner ovens.

In an evaporator burner oven, fuel is evaporated from a surface without the help of an atomizer (page 3, lines 2 to 5 of the subject application). The invention provide a more reliable and effective manner of operating an evaporator burner oven, by employing fuel derived from the Fischer-Tropsch process, which allowed to reduce carbon deposits, and hence oven failure.

The Wuest reference relates to a burner for liquid fuel comprising a burner pot including a vaporizing chamber and an atomizing element in the vaporizing chamber for atomizing liquid fuel. The Wuest reference discusses in the background a so-called vaporizing burners mainly for the combustion of kerosene or petroleum. Wuest reference does not disclose Fisher-Tropsch synthesis nor does it disclose how to reduce carbon deposits. As can be seen from the comparative examples in the application in which kerosene (is considered a heating oil) is compared with the present invention. As can be seen the carbon monoxide emission is significantly reduced hence improving the efficiency of the evaporator oven.

The Chu reference relates to a process for producing Fischer-Tropsch synthesis and thus do not relate to evaporator ovens. The O'Rear reference relates to method of inhibiting oxidation in Fischer Tropsch products. Although the reference refers to Fischer-Tropsch derived fuels

considered “green fuels” and are desirable as environmentally friendly, it does not relate to how to provide a more reliable and effective manner of operating an evaporator burner oven.

In summary, none of the above-reference describe nor teach how to operate an evaporator burner oven in

The Examiner has rejected claims 2-7 under 35 USC 103(a) as being obvious over WO 00/12935 (Wuest et al. US equivalent US6,540,505) in view of US4,471,145(Chu et al.) and US6,392,108 (O’Rear) as applied to claim 1 above, and further in view of US4,133,841 (Cosyns et al.). The rejection is respectfully traversed for the following reasons.

The same remarks and argument as applied to claim 1 above applies to the rejection. Cosyns et al. reference relates to a process for upgrading effluents from synthesis of the Fischer-Tropsch type. The products are mainly gasoline, kerosene and gasoil cuts. Again, none of the above-reference describe nor teach how to operate an evaporator burner oven in a more reliable and effective manner as discussed above.

The Examiner has rejected claim 8 under 35 USC 103(a) as being obvious over WO 00/12935 (Wuest et al. US equivalent US6,540,505) in view of US4,471,145(Chu et al.), US6,392,108 (O’Rear) and US4,133,841 (Cosyns et al.) as applied to claim 7 above, and further in view of US3,607,074 (Brown et al.). The rejection is respectfully traversed for the following reasons.

The same remarks and argument as applied to claim 7 above applies to the rejection. Brown reference teaches addition of Thiophane in gasoline to change the odor of gasoline. Again, none of the above-reference describe nor teach how to operate an evaporator burner oven in a more reliable and effective manner as discussed above.

The Examiner has rejected claims 9 and 10 under 35 USC 103(a) as being obvious over WO 00/12935 (Wuest et al. US equivalent US6,540,505) in view of US4,471,145(Chu et al.), US6,392,108 (O’Rear) and US4,133,841 (Cosyns et al.) as applied to claim 7 above, and further in view of US4,932,979 (Thrasher et al.). The rejection is respectfully traversed for the following reasons.

The same remarks and argument as applied to claim 7 above applies to the rejection. Thrasher reference teaches addition of color dye to methanol fuel . Again, none of the above-reference describe nor teach how to operate an evaporator burner oven in a more reliable and effective manner as discussed above.


Accordingly, applicants respectfully request withdrawal of the 103(a) rejections.

Conclusion

Applicants respectfully request consideration and allowance of the pending claims. The Commissioner is authorized to charge fees in connection with this response to Deposit Account No. 19-1800 (File no. TS8579), maintained by Shell Oil Company. The Examiner is respectfully requested to reexamine the claims and pass the case to issue. If it would be considered helpful in resolving any issues in the case, the Examiner is encouraged to contact the undersigned at the number below.

Respectfully submitted,

INGRID M GUENTHER and
FRANK HAASE

By 
Attorney, Yukiko Iwata
Registration No. 35,748
(713) 241-5593

P.O. Box 2463
Houston, Texas 77252-2463